



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

damages claimed are absurdly exaggerated, and the settlement at the end will show this.

Commenting on the President's high purpose and his good faith, you state that the policy he sincerely believed in has failed. Here it is well to wait to the end, for it has not come as yet, and only then can this statement be made, but I venture the assertion that it has not failed so far, and that it will not fail in the end.

(3) A reversal of policy is impossible; it would place the American Government in contempt, and, further, it is a point which can hardly be discussed. You say well, however, that we must strengthen somebody, but you say ill when you state there is little choice. The Constitutionalists should be accorded every possible assistance, for they are clearly entitled to it. They have the sympathy of the mass of the people of this country, and they have done nothing to forfeit this sympathy. Theirs is a cause we should have full sympathy with, for it is one of a people securing their rights under the law and to be enabled to enjoy their personal and political liberties. They have been abused and called bandits and robbers, but it remains a fact that only where the Constitutionalists are in control is there order, and where the Federals are in control order is only a cannon's shot from their garrisons. Due to the fact that the mass of the people in Mexico are in full sympathy with them, the Constitutionalists, and, give these same people the right to secure arms, Huerta would be run into the Gulf of Mexico in a month.

(4) Armed intervention would be a shame and a disgrace to our people and their government. Here is Mexico torn by internal conflict, and to the point of exhaustion unable to withstand any armed movement, and to consider a move like armed intervention now would only clinch the statement made by the Latin American people, that the United States was only waiting for the opportunity to seize Mexico.

I beg to submit the above to your kind consideration and ask on your part a more sympathetic treatment of the Mexico case, and I believe a review of the situation in the light of recent events will convince you that this would be the right course. Believe me, with respects,

WILLARD L. SIMPSON.

[(1) Mr. Carranza's statement was made over his own signature. Assuming that deceiving his own people was "good politics," was it good morals? We had not heard that "the State Department" favored separation of the Northern States. It is the bandit Villa who has "gained ground," not Carranza, who still remains in prudent seclusion. (2) Surely the foreign residents of Mexico possess some claim to consideration. If the war is not "their business," how can it be ours? (3) We have seen no reports of disorder in towns held by the Federals. The rebels were accorded the privilege of obtaining arms on February 4th. The month within which Huerta is to be run into the Gulf expires on March 4th. (4) Undoubtedly; but—whither are we drifting?—EDITOR.]

FROM A WOMAN IN VERA CRUZ

VERA CRUZ, MEXICO.

SIR,—I am here in Vera Cruz for several weeks during this period of "Watchful Waiting," which I wish I might feel is as temporary as my stay; but the feeling here is that Huerta is good for many months yet, and

this condition of euphonious alliteration may be extended indefinitely. I suppose it is easier to wait watchfully or watchfully wait in Washington than here. Washington is so far away that only the beauty of the landscape seems to be discernible—the pure white snow of Popocatepetl is apparently all the President and Secretary Bryan can see. Their eyes do not travel down to the hillsides and valleys where people live, or rather, die, these days. They would find another color scheme—a country stained red with blood, mostly of innocent victims, and of some Americans. One would think that the white snows of Popocatepetl would reflect a rosy glow.

Vera Cruz has a floating population which is diverting, often pitiful, people going back and forth to Tampico, ruined families leaving for the States, and business men returning from New York on their way to Mexico and the interior. All are outspoken here, saying what they please in good George Ade English. In fact, there has been so much frankness at the American Consulate that the Consul has been forced to post the following notice:

CRITICISM IN THE CONSULATE OF PRESIDENT WILSON, SECRETARY-OF-STATE
BRYAN, OR ANY OTHER OFFICIAL OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT
HUERTA, THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF VERA CRUZ, GENERAL
MAAS, OR ANY OTHER MEXICAN OFFICIAL, OR ANY CONSTI-
TUTIONALIST OFFICIAL WILL NOT BE TOLERATED.

ANY ONE VIOLATING THIS RULE WILL BE IMMEDIATELY EJECTED FROM THE
CONSULATE.

By Order,

W. W. CANADA,
United States Consul.

It seemed to amuse one big Texan who had lost his all under Madero's régime and who had, perhaps not in chosen language, expressed his idea of the "Wilson Policy" at the Consulate. He roared with laughter when shown the notice and asked who wanted the job, the three efficient but not physically robust clerks, or the little dog who is so time-worn as to have no teeth. He was tipped back in his chair, recounting this to a group of—may I say rough-necks?—and was sipping a cooling drink. I was talking with two officers from our ships. I suggested that here at last was a shore job for some of our impatient marines and cooped-up blue-jackets; something that would give them exercise and plenty of it, and make them feel like fighting men. But my suggestion was considered frivolous.

There is excitement here now on account of the situation of the banks and the fact that Huerta decreed a legal holiday. This is not to keep the banks from failing. Oh dear, no! It is so that influential insiders will have time to go in the back door and get their money out, with the result that the small accounts—savings and sacrifices of years, perhaps—will go unpaid. I really boil when I think of the sacrifice of the innocent in all this trouble. Our Government has missed its target about as cleverly as any Mexican Federal put into the army the preceding day would miss his. Doubtless our Government wishes to ruin Huerta financially. What happens? Huerta gets all the money there is. The rich people get their money out of the country, and the thousands of poor savers are the ones hit.

Another phase: Our Government orders Americans from Mexico. Whom does it hit hardest? The big mine-owners and other large interests are injured to a certain extent; but it ruins thousands of hard-working Americans and their families, who cannot remain on their farms and plantations

because the United States does not demand of the Mexican Government with *intent to enforce*, either an indemnity or punishment in the case of murdered Americans.

And what happens to the farms and ranches our Americans are forced to leave? They are left to the consuming jungle, or taken over by others. It is hard to say that nobody, unless protected by force, is safe in these parts from drunken Rebels or Federals, according to what they call themselves at the moment; but Germans and Englishmen are infinitely safer than Americans or Frenchmen or Spaniards. Why? Because Americans can be and have been killed and the United States does nothing. One hundred and twenty-seven have been murdered since the Madero revolution began, and not *one* accused man has ever been brought to trial. Not one cent of indemnity has ever been paid, or, apparently, even insisted upon.

Frenchmen can now be killed with impunity, for in some parts they are under the protection (?) of our Nation, and so Mexicans cannot understand why Frenchmen should receive more protection than our own people. (They understand us very little.) Spaniards are always in danger, because Spain has never been in a position to do anything. The Mexicans, therefore, have no respect for a Spaniard. It is the English and Germans who are respected here. Both of these nations force Mexico to live up to treaty obligations, and both have clever men in the capital, well backed by their home governments, to do the forcing. These men do what they say they are going to do, and don't threaten or waste words. We must admit that General Scott's association with these people was successful. He enjoined his subordinates: "Never argue with a Mexican. Tell him." This may all sound bitter. It is not bitterness for myself, for our own particular interests have not been seriously damaged. I am bitter for others; for the suffering, the ruin, the desolation on all sides, and for the anguish of the poorer Mexicans, the innocent victims of this terrible misunderstanding.

On all sides is the question, what is the end? and the simple answer, American Intervention. I dread intervention, for I know what it would mean. I dread it not because I fear resistance, for there would be little of that; not because of loss of life, for I firmly believe the loss of life would be exceedingly small; but I dread it because it is an educational task. That may be what appeals to our President. A never-finished occupation of an immense territory to what end? The effort to force a square block into a round hole; to force a government on these people that they neither desire nor are capable of understanding, and which no more fits them than does our own system fit the mulatto population in President Wilson's State of Virginia.

In spite of our time-honored Monroe Doctrine, Germany secures indemnity and punishment for murders of Germans. We deliver ring-memoranda, antepenultimatums, as Colonel Harvey calls them, and they are utterly ignored. We then announce that we shall watchfully wait. If Americans were not a naturally self-reliant lot here, as elsewhere, with a reputation for efficient and economical use of automatic pistol ammunition, or if the Mexican people did not believe that our President and Mr. Bryan are alone in their position, the situation of Americans would be even more dangerous. We stand on our own feet, and so far have neither received nor expect to receive protection which is our due—or which we once thought was our due, once for a long time, while our Administration gave more thought to Americans than to aliens in alien lands.

To speak again of this haggard and haggled recognition of Huerta. England recognized the *de facto* Government immediately because there was business to be carried on which had to pass through the usual governmental channels. Our business has been greatly jeopardized by the non-recognition of Huerta by the United States. The position of interests and Americans would be almost intolerable here if it were not for the personally pleasant relations existing between our *chargé d'affaires*, Nelson O'Shaughnessy and General Huerta. That the delay in recognizing was used to gain time and in lieu of a definite policy there is now practically no doubt. It was not until the month of August that the Mexican situation was put on the single-track mind of the President. After a round-trip excursion of a few days, for the President stopped just where he started and apparently looked only on one side of the track, he announced a policy called the Elimination of Huerta. Of course, that is not a policy, but it is explained to the lay mind that there *is* a policy, this being the first step. Perhaps the President, from his own intellectual heights, considers his fellow-citizens unable to grasp the policy if unfolded. Perhaps the following steps of the policy depend upon the successful accomplishment of the first longed-for move. In the mean time the prestige of Americans—no, not of Americans, but of the Power of the United States—has diminished until it is *nil*.

I have just seen Mr. John Lind, our special envoy here, in the portales. He is quite a character and an interesting figure. He is a tall, slim old gentleman, with keen eyes and a slow, deliberate way of speaking. He has the reputation of being silent, and he certainly keeps out of the public eye. He is rarely even seen in the streets, and lives at the American Consulate. It is believed that he is becoming educated in regard to the situation, and that his views are not entirely in accord with those of the Administration on every point. I sincerely trust this is not the case, for we must want the policy, whatever it is, to succeed, and it cannot unless there is a strong hand to blindly push it forward. It is to be expected that if Mr. Lind remains here and begins to understand conditions, he will naturally drift further and further away from the Administration's point of view. It looks as if this were happening, and Mr. Lind, I judge, is so independent and honest that he would leave or allow himself to be recalled if he does not approve the course.

Mr. John Lind is one of the surprising Americans who, experienced and educated far from the scene of a situation, get an accurate and adequate idea of it on short notice.

I have just been sitting down-stairs and reading a Mexican weekly. There is a cultivated article therein, with many long words, exhorting Mexicans to arise and save Mexico for the Mexicans, and, as an Englishman near by drawled, "Go back to hanging on the trees by their tails." This refrain, Mexico for the Mexicans is popular. It is on a par with the popular theme of the Monroe Doctrine, and understood just about as well as the average Americans understand that doctrine. What does the impossible realization of this dream of Mexico for the Mexicans mean? It means that all the big industries which employ thousands of workmen and pay them a living wage, and more, will shut down. Though we are told by our President that this is a race of achievements, it is difficult to discover exactly what these achievements are. The development of the country agriculturally? Perhaps—to the extent to which it *is* developed, which is

ridiculously and sinfully limited. The development of mines? No. Ninety-five per cent. of mines are owned and managed by foreigners. The operation of smelters? No. The development of petroleum? No. These branches are in the hands of Americans. Sugar, rubber, and coffee plantations are owned most extensively by foreigners. Along other lines of development: who built the railways? English and American engineers. Who installed the large portworks in Vera Cruz, Tampico, Coatzacoalcas and Manzanillo? Englishmen and Americans. Electric lighting and tramways all over the Republic are financed and operated by Canadians, Englishmen, and Americans. The great architectural achievements have been in the hands of Italian artists and engineers since the Spaniards were driven away. There is hardly a city in Mexico without its long-unfinished market, theater, or palace, monuments to patriotic outbursts which put the construction in the hands of Mexican engineers. It will be readily seen that the biggest practical interests, which together employ hundreds of thousands of workmen at good wages, would be killed by Mexico for the Mexicans, for these people cannot administer great things.

An army of unemployed would thus be thrown either back to the ranches to work for two reals per day (worth, at present, less than ten cents) for their compatriots, or more likely they would take up brigandage as a more diverting and lucrative occupation. It is the foreign capital which has raised the standard of pay and forced the unwilling ranch-owner to pay his peons a living wage to keep his men from moving to other ranches foreign owned, or to the foreign mines and smelters. It is the foreign capital invested in the development of Mexico which has given the country its position in the eyes of the world. "The People" is the cry of all republics. "The good of the people." The more that foreigners go into Mexico, the better it is for the masses, the ones who do the work, and the worse it is for the trouble-raising class who want Mexico for the Mexicans, a ten-cent wage, twelve hours per day, and lard-oil lamps cleaned by two-peso-a-month slaves.

We all believe, of course, that we are going as fast as possible on the road to intervention, in consequence of the Administration policy. A prominent Senator, when asked why he favored this policy, said, "Because I want intervention and this is the quickest way to get it." That leads to the question, when will there be intervention, and for what reason shall we intervene now, having accepted practically every national insult, and having waived every reason for intervention made international law by Mr. McKinley's declaration of intervention in Cuba?

I am forced to believe, though it goes against the grain, that intervention will come to avenge the wrongs of Europeans and not those of Americans; for the Administration has provided itself with an answer to a new "Remember the Alamo" war-cry in "We carefully warned those Americans to leave Mexico." France has cleverly placed a portion of her nationals under our protection. When Frenchmen in Mexico receive the treatment Americans have received, France will naturally fail to understand that her citizens were killed as a means to the end of establishing the Consent of the Governed in Mexico, and will probably demand that damages be paid by our own taxpayers. That is the logical result of the Monroe Doctrine, which says to Europe: "Stay out! You can't redress the wrongs of your citizens in Mexico as you can in Asia!" Carry this further. The big rich dog-in-the-manger that prevents protection of Europeans is responsible; and we

understand that this big rich dog-in-the-manger has signed a Convention which will force it to allow this question to come before the Hague Tribunal of European judges. The success of France will be followed by other European nations, saying, "Protect our citizens or we waive the Monroe Doctrine." The Hague Tribunal will make us pay claims, just and unjust, and we will be in the position of the fond parent who allows her child to break toys in a shop, and says, with a deprecating smile: "He is *so* active and destructive. Yes, I'll pay for all he's broken," instead of having administered the proper punishment.

What a position, what a "predicament as a nation in which we find ourselves!" as Colonel Harvey says. That it is a predicament there is no doubt. That it is the most serious question that confronts us as a nation there is not the slightest doubt. That the public has a right to know what "The Policy" is, no one can deny. "The first step is the elimination of Huerta." That gives us no clue as to the policy. Neither does "Watchful Waiting" mean anything but a catchy alliteration which it is strange the President failed to realize would appeal to a fun-loving nation.

I wish the President's policy could succeed. I know this country and the people. The President doesn't. He is speaking to them in a language they do not understand. His information comes from people who have been here only a short time, and who are incapable, no matter how clever and enlightened they may be, of having a real grasp and understanding of the situation. The idea of the President seems to be to put a fresh, unbiased mind to work on the subject. I might also add, a mind entirely blank and ignorant of the situation. Now is it possible that a man like this, with no groundwork of experience, can describe the true situation, any more than a boy with no foundation in arithmetic can solve problems in trigonometry? The eyes must become accustomed by long residence to the brilliant sunlight of Mexico before they can see clearly.

EDITH MACK.